



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

phœnix in chap. 6. Christian ministers are referred to as "priests" (chap. 16) and apparently as "spiritual fathers" (chap. 13).

The *Testament of Job*, which may also be Christian (although its Christian origin is far less distinct), has been hitherto overlooked by most; and so this reissue of it from another manuscript is not unwelcome, although it is clearly out of place among *anecdota*. It is conjecturally assigned to the second or third century.

The new *Acts of Thomas*, which are found in the same manuscript as Baruch, are late, but by no means without interest. They contain an *agraphon* not mentioned either by Resch or Ropes: "He who ransoms many souls shall be great in my kingdom" (chap. 6).

It goes without saying that the work is well edited. It makes no claim to thoroughness, but that cannot be expected in a volume of this kind. The texts are printed that others may interpret them. A few misprints have escaped correction in the extract from Professor Zahn's letter on pp. xxii and xxiii.

W. TAYLOR SMITH.

EXETER, ENGLAND.

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE. By ARTHUR CUSHMAN MCGIFFERT, PH.D., D.D., Professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897. The International Theological Library. Pp. xii + 681. \$2.50 net.

IN HIS preface Professor McGiffert describes the apostolic age as the age of the New Testament. But by this he does not mean the period covered by the New Testament literature, which would extend from about 46 A. D., the date of the earliest document, to the middle of the second century, where 2 Peter is placed. He rather means the period during which the apostles, or any of them, were still active; and therefore the limit is the death of John, about 98 A. D. Within these limits the author has arranged his material in a simple and scientific manner. There are only six chapters. The first treats of the origin of Christianity under three heads: Judaism, John the Baptist, and Jesus; but the second is really part of the first, so we have here a compact presentation of what we may call the organism and its environment. Chap. 2 deals with primitive Jewish Christianity; chaps. 3 and 4 with the belief and work of Paul; chap. 5 with the church at large, and chap.

6 with the development of the chief churches of the empire, including remarks upon their unity and organization.

With a plan so broadly drawn, it has not always been easy for the author to introduce everything that is expected in a book of this kind; but this disadvantage is more than offset by the comprehensive view which one gains of the whole subject. If apparent unity has sometimes been secured by the purely mechanical device of avoiding the use of subsections and subtitles, the reader will gladly admit that there lies behind all that a real unity, due to the author's masterly grasp of the issues of the period, and by his power of lucid exposition. It may be thought by some that too much attention has been devoted to Paulinism, but for this very good justification may be found in the New Testament itself. The discussion of organization and of worship does not occupy many pages, but where shall we turn for extended information on these topics before the close of the first century? Professor McGiffert has clearly conceived his task, and has recognized the limitations under which it must be performed. The result is a book meritorious both for what it does and for what it leaves undone, a combination which unfortunately is rare. It should be added here that the design of the book has been carried out; it is "constructive and not destructive."

After rapidly sketching the development of the Messianic hope among the Jews, and describing the evidence afforded by the preaching of John the Baptist, that no religious reformation could succeed at that time without being based upon the popular belief in the approaching divine kingdom, the author passes to a consideration of the work of Jesus. From the outset we hear in his preaching a new note, that of personal fatherhood as the relation between God and man. The Jews had for some time regarded God as their Father in a national sense, but now the relation became individual. Using this truth as the cornerstone, Jesus built upon the popular Messianic expectation. That he was himself the Messiah appears to have first become clear to him at his baptism, a circumstance which is intelligible in the light of the prevailing conception that the Messiah would be a man chosen and equipped of God for his mission. The temptation was a critical attack of doubt as to the reality of his Messianic call, from which he emerged victorious. Jesus' historic significance is not that he stood in the line of the prophets, nor that he proclaimed the advent of the kingdom, nor that he lived a consecrated life and taught a pure morality; it is that he persuaded the few who adhered to him until the end that he

was indeed the promised Messiah, and that the kingdom was to find in him its founder and its head. The disciples regarded him simply in this light, and needed, in addition, neither his deity nor the perfection of his humanity as a foundation for the church. Though his death at first threatened to destroy what had been begun, it had precisely the opposite effect, for appearances of the risen Lord, of a character to convince his followers of their reality, gave them courage for the new beginning. The Messiah had come, but it was plain that the time for the establishment of the Messianic kingdom was not yet ripe; hence upon them devolved the task of preparation which Jesus had just laid down. The return of the disciples from Galilee to Jerusalem with this resolve was epoch-making, because at this point (not on the day of Pentecost) begins the history of the Christian church.

The disciples, personal friends of Christ, were now apostles, *i. e.*, primarily missionaries, the chosen messengers of his kingdom. It is true the book of Acts represents them as officials of the church, as an apostolic college, but this was the view at the time the book was written and in which its author shared; it was not the primitive conception. "The official character which has been ascribed to the apostles since the second century was the result of carrying back to them the official character of the bishops" (p. 97, n.). The question arises, What were these missionaries to preach? Their leader was dead, and if they would establish his Messianic claims they must overcome the prejudice caused by this event by proving that he was nevertheless the Messiah. Peter's speech on the day of Pentecost is the earliest Christian apology of which we know, and it breathes throughout the spirit of primitive Jewish Christianity. The point to which our author particularly draws attention is that this address shifts the emphasis "from the gospel itself to the evidence of its truth, from the message to the messenger" (p. 54). The change was inevitable, yet momentous for the future development of Christianity. In Peter's speech the argument turned upon the meaning of the charismatic phenomena of Pentecost, but it was not long before Christ's death became the crucial point, and this was interpreted in harmony with the conception of a suffering Messiah, which had made its way to a certain extent into the popular mind.

As for the life of these primitive Christian believers, it did not differ in any noticeable respect from that of their Jewish brethren. They kept the law, as Jesus himself had done; they baptized converts; so did Jesus; so did John; so had these same disciples before their Master's death. They did not baptize according to the formula of Matt.

28:19, but simply in the name of Christ. But all the disciples were united by a common hope, a common faith, and a common purpose, and thus they formed one household. Every meal was a Lord's Supper, and to this simple commemorative act they attached at first no paschal significance whatever. The original circle was composed of Galileans, but citizens of Jerusalem and Hellenistic Jews were soon added to their number, though perhaps not so rapidly as the figures given in Acts 2 and 4 seem to indicate. The appointment of a special committee of seven to care for the poor among the Hellenists is, however, an indication of rapid growth. Dr. McGiffert takes occasion at this point to correct an earlier view, published in his edition of *Eusebius*, and now maintains that these "seven men" of Acts 6 were not presbyters, but temporary officers of the Jerusalem church, with no successors.

The first conflict with Judaism seems to have arisen from the simple charge that the disciples were disturbers of the peace. But when Stephen's death had given the signal for a general outbreak against the followers of Jesus, they at once began to be recognized as heretics, and were henceforth more and more marked off from their fellow-Jews. Dispersed, they formed little ἐκκλησίαι here and there, as the apostles and other preachers went from place to place with their message. With the conversion of Cornelius (not with that of the Ethiopian eunuch, who was doubtless a Jew) began the work among the Gentiles, in which the agent was Peter. There was nothing in the Cornelius incident, when reported to the church at Jerusalem, to suggest that the Jewish law was in danger, for the disciples failed to realize all that was involved, but the rapid rise of the Gentile Christian community at Antioch gave the situation a different aspect. Here the chief actor, although not the original founder, was the apostle Paul.

Professor McGiffert first examines Paul's doctrinal belief, maintaining that this underwent no substantial change from the beginning of his preaching to the end. His system was practically complete before he began his work, and its roots lie far back in his Jewish period. His apparently sudden conversion was in fact not without preparation. We can infer the progress of his thought at this crisis from his own writings more safely than from the three narratives in the Acts, although the most reliable of these (chap. 26) gives us important information about the external circumstances. Paul had always been a conscientious and earnest man, and, while still an ardent Jew, the dualism in his nature between will and desire had confronted him as an insoluble problem. The evil desire, he concluded, was inbred in the flesh, while

its opposite, viz., spirit, with its accompanying holiness, was unattainable. That he was already reduced to despair the words of Rom. 7:24 clearly indicate. But then came the vision of the risen Lord, a revelation of *spiritual being*, something whose very existence Paul had almost come to doubt. This spiritual Christ was, of necessity, a holy being, not an ordinary man, otherwise there was no place for him in Paul's thought, and appearing thus to Paul, not as one who rewards his servants with wages, but as one who is a Savior from sin, he supplied him with a new conception of the Messianic office. Christ enters into man's very being and unites him to himself, thought Paul. "Death with Christ unto the flesh and resurrection with him into a new life in the Spirit . . . constitute the sum and substance of his Christianity." Faith is the attitude of receptivity toward Christ, or toward the Spirit, which is the same thing, and the result of faith is salvation, which becomes complete only after a prolonged struggle, when at last man is released from all contact with the flesh, which is in its very nature evil. Hence the fervent joy of Paul's outburst in Rom. 7:25. His idea of the believer's union with Christ involved release from the bondage of law, the Jewish law included, and when he realized the consequences of his position he boldly faced them, taking his stand as the Apostle of the Gentiles.

Professor McGiffert discusses with clearness the distinction which must be drawn between the Christianity of Paul and that of the church at large. Most of Paul's own converts, and, *a fortiori*, the converts of other apostles, were unable to grasp his deeply spiritual conception of the gospel as a vital union of the believer with Christ in the Spirit. They took Paul's teaching of freedom and interpreted it to mean freedom from the Jewish code alone; the Christian's law is new and higher, but it is law still. We find this legal conception of Christianity in Hebrews, James, Revelation, the pastoral epistles, Jude, 2 Peter, Clement of Rome, the Didache, Barnabas, Polycarp, and Justin Martyr. "Conformity to law was the ethical watchword of the age," within as well as without the pale of the church. The original gospel of the fatherhood of God is rarely met with in early Christian literature. A materialistic notion of Christ's future reign was widely prevalent, and to that reign believers looked forward. To have part in it was salvation, and salvation was conditioned upon faith, which meant "the assured conviction that what God has promised or threatened he will perform" (p. 458). Faith was thus an act of the intellect, it was knowledge, it was the opposite of doubt. The church at large thus

took the first step toward a later conception of faith as the assent to certain propositions, the *fides quæ creditur*. It must be remembered that this common Gentile Christianity, the prevailing type in the early church, is as distinct from Paulinism on the one hand as it is from Jewish Christianity on the other, and Dr. McGiffert has done a great service in thus insisting upon a recognition of its true character and in showing that it cannot historically be identified with the teaching of Paul as over against the Jewish type.

Paul's missionary activity and writings are discussed by Professor McGiffert at considerable length. He agrees with O. Holtzmann and with Harnack that the generally accepted chronology is five or six years too late. The following dates, taken from a convenient table at the end of the book, will show the most important features of the author's scheme :

- Paul's conversion, 31 or 32 A. D.
- His first visit to Jerusalem, 34 or 35 A. D.
- Work in Syria and Cilicia, after 35 A. D.
- Evangelization of Galatia (first journey), before 45 A. D.
- Second visit to Jerusalem (apostolic council), 45 or 46 A. D.
- Epistle to the Galatians, c. 46 A. D.
- Evangelization of Macedonia and Achaia (second missionary journey), c. 46-49 A. D.
- Epistles to the Thessalonians, c. 48 A. D.
- Evangelization of Asia (third missionary journey), c. 49-52 A. D.
- Trouble in the church at Corinth, epistles to the Corinthians, notes to Timothy and Titus, c. 51-52 A. D.
- Last visit to Corinth, 52-53 A. D.
- Epistle to the Romans, note to the Ephesians, 52-53 A. D.
- Last visit to Jerusalem, arrest, 53 A. D.
- Imprisonment in Cæsarea, 53-55 A. D.
- Journey to Rome, 55-56 A. D.
- Imprisonment in Rome, 56-58 A. D.
- Epistles to Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, and Philippians, note to Timothy, 56-58 A. D.
- Death of Paul, 58 A. D.

Some such reconstruction of the chronology has been expected since the publication of Dr. McGiffert's brief article on the duration of Peter's activity in Rome, in the first number of this journal. Many of the difficulties which the new dates seem at first to present are satisfactorily met, provided one takes the author's view of the book of Acts, that it is a compilation from sources of unequal value and pervaded by the spirit

of a later age. On one of the most important points, the date of the accession of Festus, strong arguments are given for pushing it back to the year 55.

Of course, questions properly belonging to New Testament introduction demand attention in any book on the apostolic age, and the views of a scholar of Dr. McGiffert's standing are of great interest. A new theory of the position of Paul's epistle to the Galatians is here offered, viz., that it is the earliest of his letters, dating from the year 46, very soon after the apostolic council. The epistle is skillfully interpreted in harmony with the peculiar conditions created by the council and by Peter's subsequent visit to Antioch. Thoughtful suggestions are also made regarding the time when the apostolic decree was adopted, a little later than the council. It was to bring this decree that emissaries then came from James to Antioch. In discussing the disagreement between Paul and Peter, Professor McGiffert is so anxious to do the latter full justice that he advances arguments in justification of his conduct which seem to the reviewer to lack force and cogency. On the other hand, the author's sensible opinion that the Galatian letter settled once for all the controversy with Paul's Judaizing enemies will commend itself to many scholars. In agreement with the best recent criticism Dr. McGiffert regards all the Pauline epistles except the pastorals as authentic, and even these are based upon genuine notes of Paul. A short letter to Timothy, written from Macedonia about 52 A. D., after Paul had left Ephesus for the last time, and a longer one written from Rome about 58, just before his execution, were worked over together to form our 2 Timothy. Our epistle to Titus is based upon a note written probably before Paul's last visit to Corinth, *i. e.*, about 52, asking Titus to spend the winter with him in Nicopolis, whither he must at that time have been planning to go. Varying judgments will be pronounced upon the author's theory that the redactor of 2 Timothy and Titus composed at a later date our 1 Timothy, on a very slender Pauline foundation, with a view to promoting his own original object, viz., the "healthy development of the church by the institution of safeguards and by the formulation of rules." The epistle to the Ephesians, while genuine, was not addressed to any particular church, but was a circular letter. Its doctrinal teaching, like that of Colossians, cannot be regarded as a valid argument against its authenticity. The last chapter of Romans does not belong to that epistle, but is a separate document, a note addressed to the Ephesian church, written from Corinth to introduce Phœbe. Sub-



stantially the same view is held by Weiss, Weizsäcker, Jülicher, and others.

The epistle to the Hebrews is anonymous. It is not from Barnabas' pen, as Professor McGiffert formerly maintained. The author may have been an Alexandrian Jew, possibly a former disciple of Philo, for the thought of the epistle is decidedly Philonic. It was designed for Gentile readers. Barnabas, however, is not to be deprived entirely of the honors of authorship, for Dr. McGiffert inclines to the opinion that our 1 Peter is from his pen, breathing, as it does, throughout the Pauline spirit. This document is here dated in the early part of Domitian's reign. But 2 Peter appears in a less favorable light. It is pseudonymous—the only such book in the New Testament—and dates from about the middle of the second century. As for the apostle Peter himself, he was certainly in Rome for a considerable time, though, of course, Jerome's tradition of a twenty-five years' episcopate cannot be maintained. The difficulty arising from Paul's silence being removed by the early date of Romans and of the epistles of the captivity, it seems reasonable to suppose that Peter spent five or six years in the capital, that period being none too long to account for his overshadowing influence as reflected in the tradition of the Roman church. Date and authorship of the epistle of James are unknown, but it must have been written before the end of the first century. Jude is later, belonging to the early part of the second, and its author cannot, therefore, have been the Lord's brother. The epistles of John are anonymous, and it is uncertain whether they are all from the same hand. First John was written by the author of the fourth gospel, which it resembles in the Pauline tone of its theology. The presbyter John was probably the author of the Apocalypse, which is based upon earlier apocalypses partly Jewish in their origin, and which dates in its present form from the latter part of the reign of Domitian. It is interesting to observe that books like Colossians, Ephesians, Hebrews, and 1 Peter, which others have usually regarded as doctrinal in their aim, Dr. McGiffert finds preponderatingly practical. So far as doctrine has been introduced, it is for the purpose of reënforcing the precepts laid down for the Christian life.

Mark is regarded as the earliest and most reliable of the synoptic gospels. It was written from Rome by John Mark about 75–80 A. D., and is largely based upon information received from Peter. Luke stands next, perhaps a decade later. Its author, a Gentile Christian, is unknown except as being also the compiler of the book of Acts. Besides the

gospel of Mark he used as a source the Logia, ascribed by Papias to the apostle Matthew (which statement, by the way, our author sees no valid reason to doubt). The compiler used the Logia with greater regard to their historical setting than did Matthew, whose sources were the same as Luke's. Matthew "is an argument, not merely a picture." It was composed with the design of establishing the Messiahship of Jesus, and is arranged on the topical plan. It appears to come from a Palestinian Jewish Christian of the second or third generation, but who the author was we do not know. As for the fourth gospel, Dr. McGiffert writes: "The time is past when the fourth gospel can be explained as a mere piece of religious fiction from the pen of a second-century writer; but on the other hand the time is not yet come, and possibly may never come, when it can be claimed to be either an absolutely exact picture of Jesus' character, or a really historical account of his ministry" (p. 612). Yet Dr. McGiffert accepts as accurate the statement of Irenæus that the apostle John spent the closing years of his life in Ephesus, and died there at a great age in the reign of Trajan. The fancied relation of this gospel to the teaching of Philo is pronounced to be misleading, for there is in reality nothing in common between the two beyond their employment of the same word *logos*. Their conceptions differ widely. The statement that there are many evidences of Pauline influence in the fourth gospel (pp. 487 f.) is not entirely consistent with what our author has said about the personal influence of Paul in Ephesus being very short-lived (p. 288).

The aim of the book of Acts is to exhibit Christianity "in its relation to the state in as harmless a light as possible" (p. 348). The compiler's sources were of very unequal value, some being of the first class (*e. g.*, the travel-document), others appearing to have less historical worth (*e. g.*, parts of chap. 15). Dr. McGiffert does not think Luke wrote the book, but it is unquestionably from the same hand as the third gospel, and dates not later than the reign of Domitian.

The remainder of the book must be passed over very rapidly. The author indicates clearly and dispassionately how much is known, or may be safely inferred, respecting the organization of the church at that early age. He maintains with Sohm that while in the New Testament the word *ἐκκλησία* is used in a specific as well as in a general sense, yet the church conceived as universal preceded the individual churches both logically and historically. Of course the later conception of a unity of organization is an altogether different thing. The unity of spirit in the primitive church was promoted by the itinerant

apostles and prophets, and by the interchange of written communications. The process by which this all-embracing spiritual unity of the first days of Christianity was superseded by a unity secured through exclusion is admirably indicated. The author is less clear than might be wished in distinguishing "prophets" from "teachers." He says of the former that they "were not simply the occasional recipients of a revelation; they were in possession of a permanent prophetic gift" (p. 652). But soon afterward he represents the latter as endowed with "a permanent gift which fitted them always to instruct and edify the church, while the prophet might receive his revelations only occasionally" (p. 655).

On the whole it may be truthfully said that the volume before us is the most notable contribution to a proper understanding of the apostolic age thus far made by any American scholar, and as such it will be certain to rank high in the valuable series in which it appears.

J. WINTHROP PLATNER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

A CONCORDANCE OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT ACCORDING TO THE TEXTS OF WESTCOTT AND HORT, TISCHENDORF, AND THE ENGLISH REVISERS. Edited by W. F. MOULTON, M.A., D.D., editor of the English edition of the Winer's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, and REV. A. S. GEDEN, M.A., Tutor in Biblical Literature, Exegesis, and Classics, Wesleyan College, Richmond, etc. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons. Pp. 1037, 4to. \$7.

ALL New Testament scholars whose study has been of such a character as to require them to make much use of a concordance of the Greek text have felt for some years the urgent need of a work better adapted to their needs than anything that was in existence. Bruder, originally based almost as a matter of necessity on the now obsolete *textus receptus*, had in its latest editions professed indeed to exhibit the variations of the leading modern editors, but several circumstances combined to make the attempt far from successful. No attempt was made to exhibit any variations except those affecting the index word; thus the body of the quotation remained in the form of the *textus receptus*, a circumstance which greatly diminished the usefulness of the book for many purposes, especially for the study of constructions. Again, inasmuch as it was deemed necessary to retain the old stereo-